

market economy, and integration into European and transatlantic institutions.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 400, the matter just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PASS THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, over 900,000 women suffer violence each year at the hands of an intimate partner. We need the Violence Against Women Act to be reauthorized. It has provided over \$1.6 billion in Federal grants to prosecutors, to law enforcement officials, and to victim assistance programs; yet it was allowed to expire this past weekend.

Last week, this body passed it overwhelmingly. There is deep support in the Senate, with over 70 co-sponsors. Yet the Senate is holding this important piece of legislation up. Meanwhile, women fleeing domestic violence and children who live in violent situations wait and wait and wait.

I urge the other body to pass this bill immediately. Women and children around this Nation are counting on us. We should have passed it in the other body last week. We should not have allowed it to expire.

VITAL LEGISLATION NEEDS ADDRESSING BEFORE CONGRESS ADJOURNS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my support for moving along the Violence Against Women Act. I believe that we have more than an important responsibility to deal with this legislation. As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I can tell my colleagues of the terrible and horrific results that come from a child that has experienced violence in the home.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I think it is vital that we spend these last waning hours to address the question of a pa-

tients' bill of rights to address the question of a guaranteed Medicare drug prescription benefit for seniors. Having come from my district, I know what people are crying out for.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that as we have seen three recent votes on the floor of the House this evening, it is imperative when we look at serious issues dealing with privacy and violence against women that we have hearings and the opportunity to deliberate and add amendments to the bill so we can put forward to the American people important and vital and serious and valuable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the American people are not expecting us to be the "do-nothing" Congress. They, frankly, want us to do our jobs.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WIND FOR ELECTRICITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I represent San Diego, California, which is undergoing a tremendous crisis in terms of the price that we pay for electricity. In the last 3 months, prices have doubled and tripled. And while we have a short-term cap on those prices, we are looking to Congress to bring down the wholesale price of electricity and bring down the rates to consumers and small businesses.

Tonight, I want to speak about the long-range issue of energy and how that affects San Diego and the rest of our Nation. We all know that oil, natural gas, and home heating fuel prices are at a 10-year high. American consumers are facing record increases in domestic energy costs. This past summer households have been hit by soaring electricity rates in California, and motorists have faced astronomical gasoline price hikes. Now, in the coming winter months, high energy prices will affect households throughout the country.

The economic consequences are all too evident to individual consumers both at home and overseas. In Europe we see gasoline shortages, panic buying, and massive protests over rising prices. Furthermore, the impact does not stop with the individual consumer; the whole Nation bears the consequences. A surge in the price of energy can derail the economic expansion that we have worked so hard to achieve and maintain.

I think we know that energy supplies and prices are indeed cyclical. We have

been lulled into inaction by the long downside half of that cycle. Oil and gas have been in adequate supply and the moderate energy prices have made us forget the upside of that cycle. The energy crises of the 1970s and 1980s are forgotten history. Consequently, we have failed to implement policies to increase our energy supplies and to promote stable prices. We have steadily grown more dependent on conventional and imported energy. Congress has done very little to protect the Nation from the inevitable upswing in that cycle.

In particular, we have failed to support the development of alternative energy resources. In terms of domestic resource potential, wind energy is the most overlooked fuel source in this Nation. This resource is available in almost every State and can be utilized for electric generation more quickly than any other energy resource. Although California has been a leader, other States, such as Wyoming, Wisconsin, Vermont, Texas, Pennsylvania, Oregon, New York, Minnesota and Iowa, are beginning to utilize their wind energy resources. The use of wind power for electric generation is slowly growing.

Compared with the tax incentives for conventional nuclear energy, Federal tax support for renewable energy resources, such as wind, is relatively small. Aside from accelerated depreciation, which is shared by other fast-evolving technologies, wind facilities now qualify only for a temporary Federal production tax credit. This credit helps provide a price floor, but if the price of wind-generated electricity rises above a certain benchmark, the tax credit phases out and this credit took effect in 1994.

It was originally decided to sunset this credit in June of 1999. But several years after the credit was enacted, Congress considered repealing it when energy prices were at an all-time low. Fortunately, Congress retained the credit and later extended it until 2002. Despite waiving congressional policy, the credit has promoted use of domestic wind energy resources and has promoted technological development.

An uncertain credit and a temporary extension, however, does not support long-term planning, development and construction of electric generation projects. The experience with another credit program proves my point. Between 1986 and 1992, when the section 48 solar and geothermal credit was finally made permanent, Congress extended this credit in 1-, 2-, and 3-year increments. Sizable projects could not be undertaken because of the short eligibility period; and small short-term projects that were attempted had to be rushed to completion at great cost to meet the qualification deadline. For both policy and practical reasons, the wind production credit should be made

permanent, like the credit for solar and geothermal resources.

Our long-time reliance on conventional fuels has created a mindset which ignores alternatives. Mr. Speaker, the resulting institutional practices resist the use of nonconventional energy resources. Power management, transmission, and pricing practices need to adjust to the requirement of utilizing a new alternative resource. With the threat of another energy crisis looming in the future, Congress needs to reassess and redirect our national energy programs.

To spur that analysis and redirection, I have introduced today the Wind for Electricity Act to specifically promote the development of wind energy resources in this Nation. I know that San Diego is looking to this Congress for short-term relief from the high prices of electricity and to long-term alternative energy resources. I hope we all act soon.

RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of serving in this body for 14 years. And during the 14 years, one of the things that I have learned about our colleagues is that we all have a feeling of high regard for each other. If someone is going to say something about another Member, the protocol usually has been that the Member be told about it in advance.

This past Thursday that did not happen, as the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) got up after everyone left Washington, late Thursday, and did a special order for 1 hour; a tirade mentioning a number of Members of Congress. Now, I will not do to him what he did to our colleagues. He only mentioned me briefly, but I told the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) this morning that I would come here personally and respond to the things he said regarding me.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) said that we were too harsh in criticizing the administration for the possibility of having the administration transfer technology to China in return for campaign dollars. He went on to make two specific charges: number one, that the Cox Committee, which I served on, in fact totally exonerated the administration on those allegations; and, number two, that the Justice Department said there was no reason to believe there was any need to further investigate the transfer of campaign dollars for technology to China.

Well, let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that this gentleman, the largest single contributor

in the history of American politics, Mr. Bernard Schwartz, from 1995 to 2000, contributed personally \$2,255,000 to Democratic national candidates, DNC, the Democratic Senatorial Committee and the Democratic Congressional Committee.

□ 1915

The allegation was in 1998 when he contributed \$655,000 to those candidates that there was a potential quid pro quo because Bernard Schwartz had been lobbying for a permit waiver to transfer satellite technology to China.

Now, the Justice Department has said on the record they opposed that the President intervene to make a waiver decision, but the President went ahead on his own.

Now, in fact, our Cox committee did not even look at this issue. In fact, if the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) would have bothered to read the Cox committee report, in the appendix under the scope of the investigation it says, we did not even consider the political contribution aspect of this because other committees were looking at it and because we could not get people to testify because they pled the fifth amendment or they left the country.

But let us look at what the Justice Department said. Here is what the Justice Department said in the LaBella memo, which I would encourage our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), and every citizen in America to request from their Member of Congress:

"It is not a leap to conclude that having been the beneficiary of Schwartz's generosity in connection with the media campaign, the administration would do anything to help Bernie Schwartz and Loral if the need arose."

This was written not by a Republican. This was written by Charles LaBella, Justice Department special investigator to Louis Freeh, which went to Janet Reno.

They further said this, Mr. Speaker: "As suggested throughout this memo, there are many as yet unanswered questions. However, the information suggests these questions are more than sufficient to commence a criminal investigation."

Who would that criminal investigation have been against? It would have been against four people: Bill Clinton, Hillary Clinton, Al Gore, and Harold Ickes, who is Hillary's campaign manager in New York. It would have been against the Loral Corporation and Bernard Schwartz.

So here we have it, Mr. Speaker. The two allegations made by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) are totally false. He owes an apology to the American people. Because, number one, the Cox Committee never looked at these facts. And he should know that

unless he cannot read very well. It is right here in the text. Number two, he claims the Justice Department dismissed these allegations out of hand.

Well, I trust the American people. I would urge all of our colleagues to have this report available to every constituent across America, the LaBella memo. It is 94 pages. It is redacted, but they can read for themselves and they can see what this Justice Department, what FBI Director Louis Freeh, what handpicked Janet Reno Investigator Charles LaBella said about the need for a criminal investigation.

They name the four people in this document, and the four people are those four I mentioned along with Bernard Schwartz and the possibility of a quid pro quo for the \$655,000 and all this money being transferred.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, when I get more time, I will go through the specific findings in the LaBella memo where they raised the issue of the request coming in to the President and specifically on February 18, 1998, the President signed the waiver after the Justice Department advised him not to sign it.

On January 21 of that same year, Schwartz donated \$30,000 to the DNC. On March 2 he donated \$25,000. All through that year, he donated \$655,000 dollars. And that is why Louis Freeh and that is why Charles LaBella said there needs to be a further investigation for criminal activities involving the transfer of campaign dollars to the Democratic party, to the President and the Vice President and the First Lady and Harold Ickes based on the technology transfer to China, especially through the waiver that Bernie Schwartz got even though the Justice Department advised the President not to grant that waiver.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) owes this Congress an apology.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following documents that I just referenced:

H. Res. 463 also authorized the Select Committee to investigate PRC attempts to influence technology transfers through campaign contributions or other illegal means. In light of the fact that two other committees of the Congress have been engaged in the same inquiry and had begun their efforts long before the Select Committee's formation, the Select Committee did not undertake a duplicative review of these same issues. The Select Committee did, however, contact key witnesses who could have provided new evidence concerning such issues.

The Select Committee's efforts to obtain testimony from these witnesses were unsuccessful, however, because the witnesses either declined to testify on Fifth Amendment grounds or were outside the United States. Because the Select Committee was unable to pursue questions of illegal campaign contributions anew, no significance should be attributed, one way or the other, to the fact that the Select Committee has not made any findings on this subject. The same is true with respect to other topics as to which time